

DEC 21 2007

CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

ANTONIO FLORES FLORES,

Petitioner,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 07-72588

Agency No. A95-447-005

MEMORANDUM *

On Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted December 17, 2007 **

Before: GOODWIN, REINHARDT and W. FLETCHER, Circuit Judges.

This is a petition for review from the Board of Immigration Appeals’
 (“BIA”) denial of a motion to reopen.

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

** The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

Respondent's motion to dismiss is construed as a motion for summary disposition. So construed, the motion is granted because the questions raised by this petition for review are so insubstantial as not to require further argument. *See United States v. Hooton*, 693 F.2d 857, 858 (9th Cir. 1982) (per curiam) (stating standard). The regulations provide that "a party may file only one motion to reopen," and that the motion "must be filed no later than 90 days after the date on which the final administrative decision was rendered in the proceeding sought to be reopened." *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2). The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying petitioners' motion to reopen, filed more than seven months after final administrative decision was rendered. *See Iturribarria v. INS*, 321 F.3d 889, 894 (9th Cir. 2003). Accordingly, this petition for review is denied.

All other pending motions are denied as moot.

The temporary stay of removal shall continue in effect until issuance of the mandate.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.